

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

Claims 28-34 are currently being cancelled.

Claims 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15-17, 19 and 21-27 are currently being amended.

No claims are currently being added.

This amendment and reply cancels and amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After canceling and amending the claims as set forth above, claims 2-6, 8-13 and 15-27 are now pending in this application.

Request for Entry of After-final Amendment and Reply:

It is respectfully requested that this after-final Amendment and Reply be considered and entered, since: a) it does not materially change the scope of any of the presently pending claims, and b) it reduces the number of potential issues for appeal by canceling several claims.

Claim Rejections – Indefiniteness:

In the Office Action, claims 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15-17, 19 and 21-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite, because “the current date” does not have sufficient antecedent basis. Due to the amendments made to claims 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15-17, 19 and 21-27 to recite “a current date”, this rejection has been overcome.

Claim Objections:

In the Office Action, claim 27 was objected to, because it was listed as “Previously Presented” in the previously-filed response, when in fact it should have been listed as “Currently Amended”. Applicant apologizes for this error in the previously-filed response,

whereby claim 27 is listed as “Currently Amended” in this response (due to amendments made to that claim, whereby the minor amendment made to claim 27 in the previously-filed response is not shown with underlined text in this response, since it is assumed that that amendment was entered by the Examiner).

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

In the Office Action, claims 2-6, 8-13 and 15-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,882,348 to Hirono in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,734,873 to Herf and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,948,131 to Neven and U.S. Patent No. 5,848,373 to Delorme. These rejections are traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

Presently pending independent claim 2 recites, among other things, an ‘interaction connection means’ for regarding, as persons to interact with, the user IDs of other users corresponding to given specified other users position marks when the user specifies the given other users position marks and starting an interacting function program to provide connection.

On page 22 in the final Office Action, in the ‘Response to Arguments’ section, it asserts that ‘The Examiner answers that Hirono teaches linking devices to each other by cellular or wireless modem for direct communication of each other’s position (see col 21, lines 55-65) and a device placing a call to another device enters a location (see col 39, lines 60 - 67). Therefore, contrary to Applicant’s argument, the prior arts teach Applicant’s claimed invention.’

Applicant disagrees with the above-cited assertions made in the final Office Action.

Firstly, it appears to be the case that the above-cited assertion in the final Office Action is directed to Delorme, and not Hirono (note that Hirono only has 16 columns in total).

Secondly, Delorme does not disclose or suggest the claimed ‘interaction connection means’. In more detail, the description in column 39, lines 60-67 of Delorme is as follows:

‘Screen sharing is not limited to messages. A time and place location might be assigned to a function like placing a call to a selected phone number as well as a

received message. Thus, at breakfast a homebound spouse can program the commuting worker spouse's PDA to CALL HOME, during the usual commute home, from a selected location. The PDA proceeds to wake up and place the call from the commuter's vehicle when GPS position sensor data coincides with the selected place e.g. the neighborhood grocery store, within the proper time frame e.g. to 6 PM...'.

So, based on the technology disclosed in Delorme, the user has to know the destination address, e.g., CALL NUMBER, e-mail address, etc., before he/she sets 'a time and place location' assigned to a function like placing a call to a selected phone number, etc.

Contrary to the above technology disclosed in Delorme, the present invention according to claim 2 has an interaction connection means 'for regarding, as persons to interact with, the user IDs of said other users corresponding to given specified other users position marks when said user specifies said given other users position marks'. Put in another way, in the present invention according to claim 2, with specified other user position marks, a user can start an interacting function program to provide connection between the user and other users corresponding to given specified other users position marks.

That is to say, when a user of the present invention according to claim 2 starts an interacting function program, he/she does not need to know the destination address which the user of Delorme has to know.

Accordingly, since Delorme does not teach or suggested the claimed interaction connection means, and since none of the other cited art of record rectifies this deficiency of Delorme, presently pending independent claim 2, as well as presently pending independent claims 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15-17, 19 and 21-27 that recite similar features, patentably distinguish over the cited art of record.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the final Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date August 27, 2009

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5535
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Phillip J. Articola

George C. Beck
Registration No. 38,072

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819